



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,686	09/23/2003	Larry B. Pearson	1033-SS00414	1039
84326 7590 11/17/2009 AT & T LEGAL DEPARTMENT - Toler ATTN: PATENT DOCKETING ROOM 2A-207 ONE AT & T WAY BEDMINISTER, NJ 07921				
EXAMINER				
SAMS, MATTHEW C				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/17/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/668,686

Applicant(s)

PEARSON ET AL.

Examiner

MATTHEW SAMS

Art Unit

2617

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 43, 44, 49, 54-68 and 70-87 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 43, 44, 49, 54-68 and 70-87 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/6/2009 has been entered.
2. Claims 43, 54, 56, 59, 61, 65, 66 and 71-73 have been amended. Claims 84-87 have been added. Claims 45-48, 50-53 and 69 have been canceled.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 43, 44, 49, 54-68 and 70-87 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 43, 44, 49, 60, 61, 70-77, 79-81 and 84-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Contractor (US-7,006,833) in view of Arend et al. (US-2002/0102968 hereinafter, Arend).

Regarding claim 43, Contractor teaches a system for manipulating call redirection (Abstract and Col. 1 line 51 through Col. 2 line 40), the system comprising:

a communication module (Fig. 3 [114]) to determine proximity zone data of a subscriber by receiving information from a plurality of proximity sensors associated with the subscriber (Fig. 5 [503] & Fig. 6 [602 or 603]), wherein each of the plurality of proximity sensors indicates proximity zone information based on whether a mobile communication device of the subscriber (Fig. 6 [304] and Col. 8 lines 30-33 "radio frequency-based (rf) device") is detected within a proximity zone associated with the proximity sensor (Col. 9 line 65 through Col. 10 line 6), wherein the plurality of proximity sensors includes at least a first proximity sensor (Fig. 6 [602 or 603]) associated with a first proximity zone (Col. 11 lines 14-19 or lines 31-33) and a second proximity sensor (Fig. 5 [503]) associated with a second proximity zone (Col. 10 lines 30-31), and wherein the first proximity sensor communicates via a first network to the communication module (Fig. 6 and Col. 11 lines 14-22) and the second proximity sensor communicates via a second network to the communication module; (Fig. 5 and Col. 10 lines 26-34)

a proximity zone database (Fig. 3 [116]) coupled to the communication module (Fig. 3 [114]), the proximity zone data storing the proximity zone data; (Col. 9 lines 23-32) and

a call direction control system (Fig. 3 [114]) coupled to the proximity zone database to redirect calls directed to a primary destination address (Col. 9 lines 12-14) of the subscriber (Col. 9 line 65 through Col. 10 line 6 and Fig. 4B [410]):

to a first selected address when the proximity zone data indicates that the subscriber is in the first proximity zone (Col. 7 lines 57-67), wherein the first selected address is a telephone number of a device in the first proximity zone; (Col. 7 line 64 and Col. 9 lines 54-65)

to a second selected address when the proximity zone data indicates that the subscriber is in the second proximity zone (Col. 7 line 38 through Col. 8 line 9), wherein the second selected address is an email address associated with the second proximity zone; (Col. 7 line 64) and

to a third selected address when each of the plurality of proximity zone sensors indicates that the proximity indicator is not detected within the proximity zone associated with the respective proximity sensor (Col. 10 lines 6-10), wherein the third selected address is associated with a mobile communication device of the subscriber. (Col. 10 lines 10-13)

Contractor differs from the claimed invention by utilizing "proximity sensors" instead of cradles, with the cradles requiring electrical contact with the mobile communication device of the subscriber to determine proximity information.

In an analogous art, Arend teaches a location based telecommunications restricting system (Abstract) that includes a wireless handset (Fig. 4 [80]) and a proximity sensor (Fig. 4 [84]) integrated within a cradle (Fig. 4 [82]), wherein the cradle

provides an electrical contact with the wireless handset (Page 2 [0029]) for determining the presence of the wireless handset. (Page 2 [0029]) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to be motivated to implement the location based call forwarding system of Contractor after modifying it to incorporate the use of cradles for determining the location of a wireless handset of Arend. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since cradles are well known devices that are typically used for storage/recharging a battery and are typically placed in locations where a user spends large amounts of time (*i.e.* located at home and at work).

Contractor in view of Arend differs from the claimed invention by not explicitly reciting "polling each of a plurality of cradles". However, Contractor in view of Arend not only teaches that the proximity sensors proactively transmit the location of the called party to the network (Contractor Col. 10 lines 26-46 & Col. 11 lines 14-21, with the proximity sensors able to be located within a cradle Arend Page 2 [0029]) but also that the SCP (Contractor Fig. 5 [114] analogous to the claimed "call direction control system" and "communication module") has the ability to query the location detection system to determine the location of a called party (Contractor Col. 9 lines 23-32) in order to properly forward the call, therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the SCP within Contractor in view of Arend in order to directly poll or query the proximity sensors (located within cradles Arend Page 2 [0029]) when needed to determine the location of a user instead of storing the location information in a separate server in order to ensure the location information being received is not outdated. One of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it reduces costs by eliminating the need for a separate server to store the possibly outdated location of a user.

Regarding claim 44, Contractor in view of Arend teaches the first proximity zone is a home proximity zone associated with a home of the subscriber (Contractor Col. 11 lines 14-30), and wherein the second proximity zone is a work proximity zone associated with a work place of the subscriber. (Contractor Col. 11 lines 31-33)

Regarding claim 49, Contractor in view of Arend teaches wherein the primary destination address is associated with a unified messaging system that receives fax, email, voice and voicemail communications for the subscriber. (Contractor Col. 7 lines 60-67 and Col. 10 lines 10-14)

Regarding claim 60, Contractor teaches the first network includes a wireless network (Fig. 5 [504 & 505]) and the second network includes a wireline network. (Fig. 6 [103, 104, 123 & 603])

Regarding claim 61, the limitations of claim 61 are rejected as being the same reason set forth above in claim 43 above.

Regarding claim 70, Contractor in view of Arend teaches detecting a change in the proximity zone data; (Contractor Col. 9 lines 48-51)

storing the changed proximity zone data; (Contractor Col. 9 lines 51-54) and
sending a second call redirection message. (Contractor Col. 9 lines 54-64)

Regarding claim 71, Contractor in view of Arend teaches the second call redirection message stops redirections of calls directed to a particular communication address of the subscriber. (Contractor Col. 9 line 65 through Col. 10 line 13)

Regarding claim 72, Contractor in view of Arend teaches detecting the change in the proximity zone data comprises receiving an indication from at least one cradle of the plurality of cradles that the mobile communication device is no longer in electrical contact with the at least one cradle. (Contractor Col. 11 lines 14-63 *i.e.* the user moves from near the home telephone to a mobile telephone and then to the work telephone, Arend Fig. 4 [82] and Page 2 [0029])

Regarding claim 73, Contractor in view of Arend teaches detecting the change in the proximity zone data comprises receiving an indication from at least one cradle of the plurality of cradles that the mobile communication device is detected in the proximity zone associated with the at least one cradle. (Contractor Col. 11 lines 14-63 *i.e.* the user moves from near the home telephone to a mobile telephone and then to the work telephone, Col. 9 lines 45-64 and Arend Fig. 4 [82] and Page 2 [0029])

Regarding claim 74, the limitations of claim 74 are rejected as being the same reasons set forth above in claim 44.

Regarding claim 75, Contractor in view of Arend teaches the first communication address comprises a unified messaging address (Contractor Col. 10 lines 12-13 voicemail/email), the second communication address comprises a home telephone number of the subscriber (Contractor Col. 9 lines 12-14), the third communication address comprises a work related address of the subscriber (Contractor Col. 9 line 10),

and the fourth communication address comprises a mobile telephone number of the subscriber. (Contractor Col. 10 line 12)

Regarding claim 76, Contractor in view of Arend teaches the work related address of the subscriber is an electronic mail address. (Contractor Col. 7 lines 60-67 and Col. 10 line 13)

Regarding claim 77, Contractor in view of Arend teaches a computer connected to a network access point sends the call redirection message. (Contractor Col. 4 lines 11-20 and Col. 8 line 66 through Col. 9 line 32 and Fig. 1)

Regarding claim 79, Contractor in view of Arend teaches the use of a router. (Contractor Col. 4 lines 14-17)

Regarding claim 80, Contractor in view of Arend teaches the use of a data network switch. (Contractor Col. 3 line 14 "SSP")

Regarding claim 81, Contractor in view of Arend teaches the call redirection message redirects a data call. (Contractor Col. 8 lines 10-16)

Regarding claims 84 and 86, Contractor in view of Arend teaches the mobile communication device includes a mobile phone (Arend Fig. 4 [80]) with one or more electrical contacts that are operative to establish electrical contact with each of the plurality of cradles. (Arend Fig. 4 [82] and Page 2 [0029] *note*: providing electrical power to the wireless handset)

Regarding claims 85 and 87, Contractor in view of Arend teaches the mobile communication device includes a personal digital assistant (PDA) with one or more electrical contacts operative that are operative to establish electrical contact with each

of the plurality of cradles. (Arend Page 1 [0002], Fig. 4 [82] and Page 2 [0029] *note*: providing electrical power to the wireless handset)

6. Claims 54-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Contractor in view of Arend as applied to claim 43 above, and further in view of Gross et al. (US-6,389,117 hereafter, Gross)

Regarding claim 54, Contractor in view of Arend teaches redirecting a call to a selected address (Contractor Abstract) based on the user location, the call direction control system receives the call. (Contractor Fig. 4A [403]) Contractor in view of Arend differs from the claimed invention by not explicitly reciting placing a second call to a particular selected address and prompting the subscriber to select an action to be taken with respect to the call after the subscriber answers the second call.

In an analogous art, Gross teaches a system and method of using a single telephone number to access multiple communication services that includes receiving a call, placing a second call to the selected address (Col. 16 lines 33-34) and prompting the subscriber to select an action to be taken with respect to the call after the subscriber answers the second call. (Col. 16 lines 16-37 and Fig. 8) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the location based call forwarding of Contractor in view of Arend after modifying it to incorporate a user menu for call action/inaction of Gross. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since even if a subscriber is using location based routing, a subscriber might find it temporarily inconvenient to always answer the phone.

Regarding claim 55, Contractor in view of Arend and Gross teaches connecting the first call and the second call to allow the caller to engage in a conversation with the subscriber if the selected action indicates to forward the call. (Gross Col. 16 lines 16-37)

Regarding claim 56, Contractor in view of Arend and Gross teaches after receiving the call, the call direction control system prompts a caller to provide the caller's name and stores a data record including the caller's name. (Gross Col. 16 lines 31-33)

Regarding claim 57, Contractor in view of Arend and Gross teaches after placing the second call, the call direction control system accesses the data record including the caller's name and plays an announcement to the subscriber that includes the caller's name before prompting the subscriber to select the action. (Gross Col. 16 lines 33-37)

Regarding claim 58, Contractor in view of Arend and Gross teaches the action is selected from a first option to answer the call and a second option to route the call to voice mail. (Gross Fig. 8 and Col. 16 line 28-37)

Regarding claim 59, Contractor in view of Arend and Gross teaches the action includes redirecting the call (Gross Col. 16 lines 36-37) to an electronic mail address of the subscriber. (Contractor Col. 7 lines 60-67 and Col. 10 lines 6-13)

7. Claims 62, 63, 65-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Contractor in view of Arend as applied to claim 61 above, and further in view of Trioano et al. (US-2006/0136546 hereinafter, Trioano).

Regarding claim 62, 63, 65 and 67, Contractor in view of Arend teaches the limitations of claim 61 above, but differs from the claimed invention by not explicitly reciting the use of an application layer communication protocol, a Remote Procedure Call, a Simple Object Access Protocol message or HTTP.

In an analogous art, Trioano teaches a triggering system to initiate communications in a mobile network (Abstract) that includes the use of SOAP messaging (Page 5 [0065]), which inherently is an application layer communication and relies heavily upon Remote Procedure Call and HTTP for implementation. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the location based call forwarding of Contractor in view of Arend after modifying it to incorporate the use of SOAP as a triggering message of Trioano since it is based on XML and is a lightweight protocol for communication between web services in computer networks.

Regarding claims 66, Contractor in view of Arend and Trioano teaches the use of electronic mail message. (Trioano Page 2 [0015 & 0018])

8. Claims 64, 68 and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Contractor in view of Arend as applied to claim 61 above, and further in view of Khan et al. (US-2002/0165988 hereinafter, Khan).

Regarding claim 64, Contractor in view of Arend teaches the limitations of claim 61 above, but differs from the claimed invention by not explicitly reciting the use of InterProcess Communication messages.

In an analogous art, Khan teaches a mechanism for retrieving network content that includes using Interprocessor communications. (Page 15 [0175]) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the location based call forwarding of Contractor in view of Arend after modifying it to incorporate the Interprocessor communication messaging of Khan since it enables easy communication between server applications.

Regarding claim 68, Contractor in view of Arend and Khan teaches the use of file transfer protocol messages. (Khan Page 16 [0182-0183])

Regarding claim 78, Contractor in view of Khan teaches the use of a modem. (Khan Page 1 [0009])

9. Claims 82 and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Contractor in view of Arend as applied to claims 43 and 61 above, and further in view of Neher (US-6,362,778).

Regarding claims 82 and 83, Contractor in view of Arend teaches the ability to transmit location data using techniques not limited to a GPS device and a radio frequency-based device (Col. 8 lines 26-33), but differs from the claimed invention by not explicitly reciting the first network is the Internet and the second network is a wireless phone network.

In an analogous art, Neher teaches personal location detection system that includes a portable locator (Fig. 2 [18]) that has the ability to transmit location data via the Internet and a wireless phone network. (Col. 13 lines 7-10, Col. 14 lines 46-48, Col. 17 lines 12-40 and Col. 18 lines 1-3) At the time the invention was made, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the location based call forwarding system of Contractor in view of Arend after modifying it to incorporate the ability to transmit location data through the Internet and a wireless phone network of Neher. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since having the ability to communicate through both the cellular network and the Internet provides a large coverage footprint for enabling the reporting of location information.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- US-2003/0064732 to McDowell et al. regarding a cradle with a proximity sensor for proximity determination with a cellular phone

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW SAMS whose telephone number is (571)272-8099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/MATTHEW SAMS/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617